UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

- - - - - - - - x

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA : <u>SUPERSEDING</u> INFORMATION

- v. -

S1 08 Cr. 207 (LTS)

ALEKSANDER RAPOPORT, :

Defendant: :

- - - - - X

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #: \_\_\_\_\_
DATE FILED: AUG / 2 com

COUNT ONE

The United States Attorney charge

- 1. From at least in or about 2004, up to and including in or about February 2005, in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere, ALEKSANDER RAPOPORT, the defendant, and others known and unknown, unlawfully, intentionally, and knowingly did combine, conspire, confederate, and agree together and with each other to violate the narcotics laws of the United States.
- 2. It was a part and an object of the conspiracy that ALEKSANDER RAPOPORT, the defendant, and others known and unknown, would and did distribute and possess with intent to distribute a controlled substance, to wit, 100 kilograms and more of mixtures and substances containing a detectable amount of marijuana, in violation of Sections 812, 841(a)(1), and 841(b)(1)(B) of Title 21, United States Code.

(Title 21, United States Code, Section 846.)

### Forfeiture Allegation

3. As a result of committing the controlled substance offense alleged in Count One of this information, ALEKSANDER RAPOPORT, the defendant, shall forfeit to the United States, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 853, any and all property constituting or derived from any proceeds RAPOPORT obtained directly or indirectly as a result of the said violations and any and all property used or intended to be used in any manner or part to commit and to facilitate the commission of the violation alleged in Count One of this Information, including \$100,000, a sum of money representing the amount of proceeds obtained as a result of the offense alleged in Count One of this Information.

### Substitute Asset Provision

- 4. If any of the above-described forfeitable property, as a result of any act or omission of the defendant:
  - (a) cannot be located upon the exercise of due diligence;
  - (b) has been transferred or sold to, or deposited with, a third person;
  - (c) has been placed beyond the jurisdiction of the Court;
  - (d) has been substantially diminished in value;
    or
  - (e) has been commingled with other property which cannot be subdivided without difficulty;

it is the intent of the United States, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 853(p), to seek forfeiture of any other property of said defendant up to the value of the above forfeitable property.

(Title 21, United States Code, Sections 841(a)(1), 846 and 853.)

MICHAEL J. GARCIA

United States Attorney

Form No. USA-33s-274 (Ed. 9-25-58)

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

# UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

- v -

## ALEKSANDER RAPOPORT,

Defendant.

## SUPERSEDING INFORMATION

S1 08 Cr. 207 (LTS)
(21 U.S.C. § 846.)

MICHAEL J. GARCIA
United States Attorney.